

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

STONE HILTON PLLC, a Texas professional limited liability company; JUDD STONE; and CHRIS HILTON,

Plaintiffs,

V.

BRENT WEBSTER, in his individual capacity; RALPH MOLINA, in his individual capacity; and JOSH RENO, in his individual capacity

Defendants.

1. *Introduction*
 2. *Background*
 3. *Methodology*
 4. *Results*
 5. *Discussion*
 6. *Conclusion*
 7. *References*
 8. *Appendix*
 9. *Index*
 10. *Table of Contents*
 11. *Abstract*
 12. *Summary*
 13. *Key Words*
 14. *Keywords*
 15. *Subject Headings*
 16. *Subject Headings*
 17. *Subject Headings*
 18. *Subject Headings*
 19. *Subject Headings*
 20. *Subject Headings*
 21. *Subject Headings*
 22. *Subject Headings*
 23. *Subject Headings*
 24. *Subject Headings*
 25. *Subject Headings*
 26. *Subject Headings*
 27. *Subject Headings*
 28. *Subject Headings*
 29. *Subject Headings*
 30. *Subject Headings*
 31. *Subject Headings*
 32. *Subject Headings*
 33. *Subject Headings*
 34. *Subject Headings*
 35. *Subject Headings*
 36. *Subject Headings*
 37. *Subject Headings*
 38. *Subject Headings*
 39. *Subject Headings*
 40. *Subject Headings*
 41. *Subject Headings*
 42. *Subject Headings*
 43. *Subject Headings*
 44. *Subject Headings*
 45. *Subject Headings*
 46. *Subject Headings*
 47. *Subject Headings*
 48. *Subject Headings*
 49. *Subject Headings*
 50. *Subject Headings*
 51. *Subject Headings*
 52. *Subject Headings*
 53. *Subject Headings*
 54. *Subject Headings*
 55. *Subject Headings*
 56. *Subject Headings*
 57. *Subject Headings*
 58. *Subject Headings*
 59. *Subject Headings*
 60. *Subject Headings*
 61. *Subject Headings*
 62. *Subject Headings*
 63. *Subject Headings*
 64. *Subject Headings*
 65. *Subject Headings*
 66. *Subject Headings*
 67. *Subject Headings*
 68. *Subject Headings*
 69. *Subject Headings*
 70. *Subject Headings*
 71. *Subject Headings*
 72. *Subject Headings*
 73. *Subject Headings*
 74. *Subject Headings*
 75. *Subject Headings*
 76. *Subject Headings*
 77. *Subject Headings*
 78. *Subject Headings*
 79. *Subject Headings*
 80. *Subject Headings*
 81. *Subject Headings*
 82. *Subject Headings*
 83. *Subject Headings*
 84. *Subject Headings*
 85. *Subject Headings*
 86. *Subject Headings*
 87. *Subject Headings*
 88. *Subject Headings*
 89. *Subject Headings*
 90. *Subject Headings*
 91. *Subject Headings*
 92. *Subject Headings*
 93. *Subject Headings*
 94. *Subject Headings*
 95. *Subject Headings*
 96. *Subject Headings*
 97. *Subject Headings*
 98. *Subject Headings*
 99. *Subject Headings*
 100. *Subject Headings*

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:25-cv-00983

**UNOPPOSED MOTION TO EXTEND TIME FOR PLAINTIFFS
TO RESPOND TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

Plaintiffs, Stone Hilton, PLLC, Judd Stone and Chris Hilton, individually, file this Unopposed motion for an extension of time to file their response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6). (Doc. 17). For the reasons more specifically stated below, Plaintiffs request that they be granted a fourteen-day extension of time from the current, October 17, 2025 deadline, to October 31, 2025. **Because Plaintiffs' response is due no later than Friday, October 17, 2025, Plaintiffs' respectfully request that the Court rule on this motion before the response deadline expires.**

I. Introduction

This 42 U.S.C. § 1983 lawsuit against Brent Webster, in his individual capacity, Ralph Molina, in his individual capacity, and Josh Reno, in his individual capacity, arises

out of defendants' retaliatory actions against plaintiffs for lawfully exercising their First Amendment speech rights. (Doc. 11). On October 2, Plaintiffs' advised the court they did not oppose Defendants' request for leave to file their motion to dismiss in excess of the twenty-page limit set forth in Local Rule 7C2. (Doc. 16). Defendants' Motion For Leave was subsequently granted and Defendants' Motion to Dismiss in excess of page limits pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) was filed on October 3, 2025. (Doc. 17). Plaintiffs' current deadline to respond to that Motion is October 17, 2025. W.D. Loc. R. 7D-2.

Counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendants have conferred regarding a scheduling order pursuant to Fed. Rule 26(f) and will continue working towards a final scheduling order over the next two weeks. Additionally, the relief requested herein was discussed and the Defendants do not oppose extended Plaintiffs' time to respond to Defendants' motion to dismiss to October 31, 2025. Plaintiffs' counsel requests additional time to respond to Defendants' dispositive motion in light of the fact that Defendants' motion exceeds the page limitations by a considerable margin. Plaintiffs' counsel respectfully requests that the Plaintiffs be given an additional fourteen days to respond to the Defendants' motion and Defendants' counsel does not oppose this request for an extension of time.

II. Motion to Extend Time

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A) provides that "[w]hen an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time ... with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the

original time or its extension expires.” This motion is being filed before the October 17, 2025 deadline to respond to the Defendants’ motion to dismiss.

Good cause exists to extend the deadline. The undersigned counsel agreed to allow Defendants’ leave so that they could file their motion in excess of the page limits. Plaintiffs’ counsel does need additional time to respond given the scope of Defendants’ motion. Given the length in excess of the page limits, Plaintiffs request an additional fourteen days to file their response.

The Defendants are not opposed to Plaintiffs’ request and will not suffer any prejudice because of this delay. There are no current deadlines that would be adversely affected by this extension. Accordingly, Plaintiffs ask that this Court grant them a fourteen-day extension of time to respond to the Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss.

III. Prayer

For these reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court grant their motion to extend time by fourteen days, extending their deadline to respond to the Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss to **October 31, 2025** as well as such other relief to which Plaintiffs may be justly and equitably entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

By: *J. Stephen Toland*
J. Stephen Toland
State Bar No. 240
stephen@tolandlegal.com
TOLAND LAW FIRM, PLLC
1305 San Antonio Street
Austin, Texas 78701

(512) 612-9545 – Office
(512) 612-9613 – Facsimile

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

Certificate of Conference

On October 15 and October 16, 2025 the undersigned counsel conferred telephonically with counsel for the Defendants, Kimberly Gdula, regarding a final scheduling order pursuant to Fed. Rule 26(f) and the relief being requested herein. Attorney Gdula advised that she and her clients do not oppose an extension of fourteen days for Plaintiffs' to file a response to Defendants' motion to dismiss.



J. Stephen Toland

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on **October 16, 2025**, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the clerk of the court for the U.S. District Court, Western District of Texas, using the electronic case filing system of the court which will transmit notification of such filing to all counsel of record.



J. Stephen Toland